

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/621,020	TENCA ET AL.	

All Participants:	Status of Application: _____
(1) <u>Christopher A. Revak</u> .	(3) _____.
(2) <u>Michael Jones</u> .	(4) _____.
Date of Interview: <u>25 August 2005</u>	Time: <u>1pm</u>
Type of Interview:	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephonic <input type="checkbox"/> Video Conference <input type="checkbox"/> Personal (Copy given to: <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant <input type="checkbox"/> Applicant's representative)	
Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	
If Yes, provide a brief description:	
Part I.	
Rejection(s) discussed:	
35 USC 101 and 35 USC 102(b)	
Claims discussed:	
5-8,20-22,29,30	
Prior art documents discussed:	
Monier	
Part II.	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:	
See Continuation Sheet	
Part III.	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.	


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted the applicant's representative in an attempt to compact prosecution since it was determined that there existed allowable claims. Claims 5-8 and 29 were allowable over the prior art of record, however there existed a rejection of non-statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101. The examiner suggested incorporating the limitations "computer implemented method" in the preambles to overcome the rejection. Claims 20-22 and 30 were still rejected under 35 USC 102(b) and the examiner proposed cancelling those claims since the other claims were allowable over the prior art of record. The applicant's representative indicated that they needed their client's permission to perform those changes and applicant's representative was unable to contact the applicant for confirmation, so the advisory action was to be issued. The applicant is invited to make the above mentioned changes in order for the application to proceed to allowance..